Remarks

This Amendment has revised the application such that it is believed to be in allowable condition for reasons discussed below.

In regard to the object to the drawings, drawing sheet 2 has been revised to include new Figures 3 and 4 which respectively show the energy absorbers 6, 8 and 9 being resilient in Figure 3 as provided by at least one spring 6', 8' or 9' and as shown in Figure 4 as having at least one plastically deformable element 6", 8" or 9". The springs and plastically deformable elements are schematically illustrated and fully supported by the original disclosure of the application such that no new matter has been added.

In regard to the claim objections, claims 11, 12 and 14 have been revised to overcome these objections. More specifically, claim 11 has been revised to recite a "second energy absorbing means" and thereby overcomes the informality. Furthermore, both claims 11 and 14 have been revised to depend from claim 11 to also overcome their informalities.

It is respectfully submitted that amended claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-14 as well as new claim 15 distinguish over all of the cited prior art for reasons discussed below.

Claim 1 and hence its dependent claims 2-14 recite a fall arrest system including a fixed vertical cable pretension between an upper anchor point and a lower anchor point and also recite a first energy absorbing means associated with the upper anchor point to control the shock load applied to the upper anchor point in the circumstances of a fall arrest event. Contrary to the rejection in the Office Action, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-8 and 10-14 are not anticipated by United States patent 7,117,975 Matoba nor is claim 9 obvious over Matoba in view of United States patent 5,113,981 Lantz.

The Matoba patent does not disclose a fall arrest system which has a "fixed vertical cable mounted pre-tensioned between an upper anchor point and a lower anchor point" as recited by claims 1-14. This type of cable when used with an energy absorbing means

associated with the upper anchor point reduces the shock load applied to the upper anchor point when a fall arrest event takes place. Matoba does not disclose such a cable but rather discloses a chain 7 that moves about sprockets 6 and 11 and thus is not fixed in the manner recited. Rather, the movable cable of Matoba teaches away from the present invention which involves a fixed vertical cable for use with an energy absorbing means at the upper anchor point as recited.

New claim 15 recites the fixed vertical cable mounted pre-tensioned cable between the upper and lower anchor points and further recites an energy absorber element associated with the upper anchor point to control the shock load as well as more specifically defining the energy absorber element as being a plastically deformable extension energy absorber element which in the event of a fall arrest event is deployed undergoing plastic deformation. Motoba and the other references of record do not disclose a plastically deformable extension energy absorber element utilized with a fixed vertical cable and which, in the event of a fall arrest event, is deployed undergoing plastic deformation.

For the reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in an allowable condition such that it is appropriate to hereby respectfully solicit its allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

TIMOTHY GEORGE BISSETT

By 

James A. Kushman
Reg. No. 25,634
Attorney for Applicant

Date: October 9, 2009

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351